

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Official Action of February 8, 2005, relating to the above-identified application.

The Examiner is thanked for his very thorough examination of this application. It is noted with appreciation that a number of rejections have been withdrawn as set forth in the Official Action on page 3, paragraph 10.

A petition for a three-month extension of time, together with the associated fee is filed herewith.

A new title that is more descriptive has been presented.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite the feature of the invention that the integrated view data generator is capable of removing the three-dimensional view data from the integrated view data by turning off the stereo-camera while retaining the obstacle data. Basis is found on page 7, lines 15 to 18. In addition, Claims 1 and 7 now refer to obstacle data including at least one symbolized obstacle or one emphasized obstacle. Basis is found at page 6, lines 3 to 7.

New Claim 9 includes a geographical image generator 12 as shown in Figure 1.

Claim 8 has been cancelled to expedite prosecution.

It is believed that with the foregoing amendments to the title and the claims, all of the formalities have been complied with and the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Copeland* (US 4,805,015) in view of *Sato* (US 6,445,815) and further in view of *Azuma* is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Official Action indicates that *Copeland* discloses at least one stereo camera, a stereo image recognizer for processing a pair of images taken by the stereo cameras, an integrated view data generator for generating integrated view data and an integrated image display for displaying the integrated view data to a crew in a vehicle. The Official Action also indicates that *Copeland* does not disclose an integrated view data generator capable of removing 3-D view data from the integrated view data.

The Official Action relies on *Sato* and alleges that the advantages of augmented reality systems such as shown by *Sato* would motivate a person skilled in the art to use the system of *Sato* in the *Copeland* apparatus to replace the simple stereoscopic display of *Copeland*. However, the Official Action does not provide any reason, suggestion or motivation whereby a person skilled in the art would be lead to believe that the system of *Copeland* could be improved by incorporating one or more features from the *Sato* device. Furthermore, there are no guidelines to suggest selecting the particular element from *Sato* for incorporation or replacement of an element in the *Copeland* device.

Consequently, applicants submit that the Official Action fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for the subject matter of the rejected claims.

The rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over *Copeland* taken with *Sato* and *Azuma* and further in view of *Owens* and *Sarangapani* is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Official Action notes that the *Copeland* reference does not show sensors and relies on *Sarangapani* to show selectively using sensors in accordance with the actual views. The Official Action concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the combination of

*Copeland, Sato* and *Azuma* to use several types of sensor technologies. It is alleged that the use of multiple sensors allow obstacles to be observed in the stereo modeled and displayed to the user even in unfavorable viewing conditions. The Official Action continues by alleging that the use of different sensor technologies would ensure that the most suitable type of sensor is chosen. The Official Action speculates as to what a person skilled in the art might do confronted with six different references. However, there is nothing which ties them all together and certainly no teaching, suggestion or motivation found in any of the references which would lead a person skilled in the art to select the various portions of the prior art and combine them in the manner proposed in the Official Action. The rejections are clearly based on hindsight and involve picking and choosing, while ignoring other portions of the references in order to arrive at the claimed invention. This is not the proper test of obviousness and accordingly, the rejection based on the six different documents is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:   
Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531

Suite 3100, Promenade II  
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592  
Telephone: (404) 815-3593  
Facsimile: (404) 685-6893